

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MZEE BARAKA HARRIS, ) CASE NO.: C06-0954-JLR  
Petitioner, )  
v. ) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
BENEDICT MARTINEZ, )  
Respondent. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY CONCLUSION

15 Petitioner is in the custody of the Washington Department of Corrections pursuant to his  
16 2002 King County Superior Court convictions for first degree rape and second degree assault.<sup>1</sup>  
17 He has filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 seeking relief from those  
18 convictions. Respondent has filed an answer to the petition and has submitted relevant portions  
19 of the state court record. The briefing is now complete, and this matter is ripe for review. This  
20 Court, having reviewed the petition, respondent's answer thereto, and the state court record,

<sup>22</sup> <sup>1</sup> Petitioner was also convicted on a charge of first degree kidnaping, but that conviction was vacated at the time of petitioner's sentencing.

01 concludes that petitioner's federal habeas petition should be denied and this action should be  
02 dismissed with prejudice.

03 FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

04 The Washington Court of Appeals summarized the facts of petitioner's case as follows:

05 Auburn police officers were summoned to a restaurant on the afternoon of  
06 Sunday, March 3, 2002, by a call from Brandy Bonin-Gamble. All visible parts of  
07 Bonin-Gamble's body showed marks of a severe beating, and she was extremely  
08 distraught. Bonin-Gamble told police that her boyfriend, petitioner Mzee Harris, had  
09 beaten her and was at the nearby Auburn Motel. An officer found Harris, drew his  
10 gun and ordered Harris to stop, but Harris sped away in his truck. When the police  
11 chased him, Harris abandoned his truck and escaped.

12 The emergency room doctor who treated Bonin-Gamble said her injuries were  
13 "incredible" in that "there was not an inch on her body that did not have a hematoma,  
14 or a bruise." Some bruises displayed the shapes of a belt strap, some a belt buckle  
15 and one the sole of a shoe. The injuries appeared fresh and were consistent with  
16 Bonin-Gamble's report that she had been kicked and beaten all over with fists, a belt,  
17 and a baseball bat. Bonin-Gamble said that the day before, Harris came to her room  
18 at a Motel 6, demanded entry, and began beating her. He then took her to his  
19 parent's house and beat her with a baseball bat. Later he took her to a different motel  
20 where he beat her through the night, including flailing her with his belt after making  
21 her strip. Harris then took her to his friends' house and finally to the Auburn motel  
22 where she used a ruse to flee.

23 Bonin-Gamble's injuries included vaginal lacerations and bruises to her  
24 buttocks, inner thighs and labia, which led hospital staff to ask if she had been raped.  
25 Bonin-Gamble said no while male police officers were present, but later told female  
26 medical staff that Harris had repeatedly raped her. Vaginal swabs showed quantities  
27 of semen containing sperm with motility suggesting recent sexual intercourse. DNA  
28 testing showed the semen was Harris's.

29 The State charged Harris with first degree kidnapping, three counts of first  
30 degree rape, and two counts of second degree assault. It also charged him with  
31 second degree assault for a February incident in which Bonin-Gamble said he stabbed  
32 her leg with a barbecue fork.

33 At trial, in addition to Bonin-Gamble, the State called three young men who  
34 stayed next door to her on Saturday, March 2, at the Motel 6. They testified they  
35 heard a man shouting to be let in, followed by a woman's screams of pain. They later

01 saw the couple leave, the woman holding a towel to her swollen and bleeding face.  
 02 One of the men identified Harris from a photo montage. Forensic evidence included  
 03 an autographed baseball bat from a display case in Harris's parents' home with Bonin-  
 04 Gamble's and Harris's blood on it. At the Auburn hotel, police found blood on a  
 05 sheet and semen on a towel in Harris's room. Police also found blood spatter and  
 06 Bonin-Gamble's medication in the Motel 6 room.  
 07

08 Harris testified that he tried to end his relationship with Bonin-Gamble after  
 09 she lied about using drugs and falsely claimed to be pregnant with his child. On  
 10 Friday, March 1, however, Bonin-Gamble called him to her room at the Motel 6  
 11 where they had sex. She called him back to the room the next day, then appearing to  
 12 be injured and on drugs. She said a former boyfriend, Rodney, had beaten her.  
 13 Though Harris and Bonin-Gamble argued and she attacked Harris, he rented a room  
 14 at another motel for her. He met friends at the new motel, and they left Bonin-  
 15 Gamble alone while getting food from an Applebee's restaurant. Harris slept in the  
 16 room with Bonin-Gamble that night, but they did not have sex. At his parent's house  
 17 the next day, she attacked him with the bat. He later drove her to his friends' and the  
 18 Auburn motel, where he only ran from police because he feared they would shoot  
 19 him. Harris testified his only sex with Bonin-Gamble that weekend was the  
 20 consensual sex on Friday.

21 Harris's family members testified that Bonin-Gamble had attempted to  
 22 insinuate herself into his family. Defense witnesses who saw Harris and Bonin-  
 23 Gamble over the weekend testified there were times that Bonin-Gamble was alone and  
 24 could have escaped and that she did not ask for medical treatment. In addition, a  
 25 defense medical expert challenged the State's expert testimony about how recent  
 26 Bonin-Gamble and Harris's sexual intercourse could have been.

27 The jury found Harris guilty of first degree kidnapping, two of the counts of  
 28 first degree rape and both second degree assault counts for the March charges, but  
 29 acquitted him of the February assault charge and did not reach a verdict on the third  
 30 count of rape. The sentencing court found Harris committed the offenses with  
 31 deliberate cruelty and imposed a 420-month exceptional sentence.

32  
 33 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 2 at 2-4.)

34 Following his sentencing, petitioner filed a direct appeal in the Washington Court of  
 35 Appeals. However, he subsequently moved to dismiss his direct appeal on the grounds that the  
 36 issues he wished to raise were better presented by way of a personal restraint petition. (See *id.*,  
 37

01 Ex. 3.) The Court of Appeals granted petitioner's motion, and petitioner's appeal was dismissed  
02 on February 2, 2004. (*Id.*, Ex. 4.) The Court of Appeals issued its mandate on the same date.  
03 (*Id.*, Ex. 5.)

04 On January 28, 2005, petitioner, through counsel, filed a personal restraint petition in the  
05 Washington Court of Appeals. (*Id.*, Ex. 6.) Petitioner presented the following grounds for relief  
06 to the Court of Appeals for review:

07 1. Trial counsel's failure to call Warren Hagler to testify regarding his  
08 conversation with Brandy Gamble-Bonin constituted a denial of the Sixth Amendment  
right to effective representation of counsel.

09 2. Trial counsel's failure to present the Applebee's Restaurant receipt  
10 constituted a denial of the Sixth Amendment right to effective representation of  
counsel.

11 3. Trial counsel's failure to object to the prosecutor's inaccurate  
12 description of the evidence of a receipt for a purchase of food from McDonald's  
13 restaurant, and to the prosecutor's inflammatory argument regarding what the  
evidence showed, constituted ineffective assistance of counsel and a violation of the  
Sixth Amendment.

14 4. The prosecutor's inflammatory appeal to passion and prejudice, by  
15 improperly suggesting to the jury that after raping and assaulting the complaining  
witness the defendant made her go with him to a restaurant where he ordered food  
for himself but none for her, denied the defendant a fair trial contrary to the Due  
16 Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

17  
18 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 6 at 37-38.)

19 Petitioner also argued to the Court of Appeals that his exceptional sentence violated the  
20 rule announced in *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296 (2004). (*See id.*, Ex. 6 at 55-61.) On  
21 January 23, 2006, the Court of Appeals issued an unpublished opinion denying petitioner's  
22 personal restraint petition. (*Id.*, Ex. 2.)

01 Petitioner thereafter filed a motion for discretionary review in the Washington Supreme  
02 Court. (*Id.*, Ex. 8.) Petitioner presented the following issues to the Supreme Court for review:

03 1. Did trial counsel's failure to interview or call exculpatory witness  
04 Warren Hagler to testify regarding his conversation with complainant Brandy Gamble-  
05 Bonin constitute a denial of the Sixth Amendment right to effective representation of  
06 counsel?

07 2. Did trial counsel's failure to present exculpatory evidence in the form  
08 of an Applebee's Restaurant receipt constitute a denial of the Sixth Amendment right  
09 to effective representation of counsel?

10 3. Did trial counsel's failure to object to the prosecutor's inaccurate  
11 description of the evidence of a receipt from a McDonald's restaurant, and to the  
12 prosecutor's inflammatory argument, constitute ineffective assistance of counsel and  
13 a violation of the Sixth Amendment?

14 4. Did the prosecutor's inflammatory appeal to passion and prejudice, by  
15 improperly suggesting to the jury that after raping and assaulting the complaining  
16 witness the defendant made her go with him to a restaurant where he ordered food  
17 for himself but none for her, deny the defendant a fair trial contrary to the Due  
18 Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment?

19 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 8 at 1.)

20 Petitioner also argued to the Supreme Court that the cumulative prejudicial effect of trial  
21 counsel's deficient conduct constituted ineffective assistance of counsel. (*Id.*, Ex. 8 at 19.)  
22 Petitioner did not present to the Supreme Court any claim that his exceptional sentence violated  
23 the rule announced in *Blakely*.

24 On April 28, 2006, the Supreme Court Commissioner issued a ruling denying petitioner's  
25 motion for discretionary review. (*Id.*, Ex. 9.) Petitioner moved to modify the Commissioner's  
26 ruling denying review, but that motion was also denied. (*See id.*, Exs. 10 and 11.) On July 25,  
27 2006, the Court of Appeals issued a mandate terminating petitioner's personal restraint

01 proceedings. (*Id.*, Ex. 12.)

02 Petitioner, through counsel, filed the instant petition for federal habeas review under §  
 03 2254 on July 7, 2006.

04 **GROUND FOR RELIEF**

05 Petitioner asserts the following four grounds for relief in his federal habeas petition:

06 **GROUND ONE:** Ineffective assistance of counsel for failure to interview and call  
 witness, Warren Hagler.

07 Supporting facts: Mzee Harris' sister, Malika Harris, met Warren Hagler in 2002, and  
 08 he told her that he had spoken with Brandy Gamble-Bonin about the trial. Brandy  
 09 told Hagler that Mzee Harris had assaulted her but nothing more, that the police were  
 10 pressuring her to testify against Mzee Harris, and that the police threatened to put her  
 11 in jail if she did not say what they wanted her to say. Malika told her mother, Billie  
 12 Harris, about Warren Hagler, and Ms. Harris told Mr. Crowley before the trial.  
 Crowley said he would contact Hagler. Crowley never contacted Hagler, nor did  
 Hagler testify at trial. Hagler states in his declaration he would have testified about  
 Brandy's statements at trial on Mr. Harris' behalf if he had been contacted by  
 Crowley.

13 **GROUND TWO:** Ineffective assistance of counsel for failure to present Applebee's  
 Restaurant receipt into evidence.

14 Supporting facts: Private investigator Bonnie Steckler, hired by Mr. Harris' defense  
 15 counsel, interviewed both defendant and Mr. Carllen re the Applebee's Restaurant  
 16 receipt. Mr. Carllen gave Applebee [sic] receipt to Ms. Steckler, who taped the  
 17 receipt to a large sheet of paper and gave it to defense counsel Crowley before trial.  
 Crowley has lost documents that Steckler has given him in the past. Steckler did not  
 18 keep a copy of the receipt. Ms. Steckler's declaration attesting to these facts were  
 filed with Mr. Harris' PRP.

19 **GROUND THREE:** Ineffective assistance of counsel for failure to object to  
 prosecutor's misconduct at closing argument.

20 Supporting facts: In closing argument, defense counsel emphasized that both  
 21 Muhammad and Carllen testified that Harris left the motel room to go pick up food  
 22 leaving Brandy in the room. "They get food, there is the receipt, it happened, Brandy  
 was able to leave on her own accord, she didn't because she didn't want to. Because  
 indeed, she had not been raped." RP XI, 144. In rebuttal, the prosecutor suggested

01 that Muhammad and Carlen were lying when they said Harris left the room, and that  
02 the proof of this was that while they talked about a receipts from Applebee's, no  
03 receipt was presented at trial. "Mr. Crowley mentioned a receipt. There was no  
04 receipt from Applebee's . . . only a receipt from McDonalds." RP XI, 154-55. The  
05 McDonald's receipt actually listed two meals.

06 **GROUND FOUR:** Ineffective assistance of counsel.

07 Supporting facts: Grounds 1-3 accumulated to cause prejudicial effect.

08 **GROUND FIVE:** Challenge to exceptional sentence imposed under Blakely v.  
09 Washington, 542 U.S. 296 (2004) for judicial finding of deliberate cruelty.

10 Supporting facts: The sentencing court found Mr. Harris committed the offenses with  
11 deliberate cruelty and imposed a 420 month exceptional sentence. Findings of Fact  
12 & Conclusions of Law re: Exceptional Sentence filed 4/22/03.

13 (Dkt. No. 1 at 5, 7, 8, 10, and 14.)

14 DISCUSSION

15 Respondent states in his response to the petition that petitioner properly exhausted his state  
16 court remedies with respect to the claims set forth in his federal habeas petition by fairly presenting  
17 each of those claims to the Washington Supreme Court as federal constitutional claims. While  
18 respondent is correct that petitioner properly exhausted his first four grounds for federal habeas  
19 relief, respondent overlooks the fact that petitioner actually identified five grounds for relief in his  
20 petition and that the fifth ground for relief was not properly exhausted in the state courts because  
21 the claim was never presented to the Washington Supreme Court for review.

22 However, the fact that petitioner failed to properly exhaust his *Blakely* claim, and that  
23 respondent failed to respond in any way to this claim, does not preclude review of the claim by this  
24 Court. Section 2254(b)(2), provides that "[a]n application for a writ of habeas corpus may be  
25 denied on the merits, notwithstanding the failure of the applicant to exhaust the remedies available

01 in the courts of the State.” As will be explained in more detail below, this Court deems petitioner’s  
 02 *Blakely* claim to be without merit and therefore subject to denial even absent exhaustion.

03 Standard of Review

04 Under the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, a habeas corpus petition may  
 05 be granted with respect to any claim adjudicated on the merits in state court only if the state  
 06 court’s decision was *contrary to*, or involved an *unreasonable application of*, clearly established  
 07 federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court, or if the decision was based on an unreasonable  
 08 determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) (emphasis  
 09 added).

10 Under the “contrary to” clause, a federal habeas court may grant the writ only if the state  
 11 court arrives at a conclusion opposite to that reached by the Supreme Court on a question of law,  
 12 or if the state court decides a case differently than the Supreme Court has on a set of materially  
 13 indistinguishable facts. *See Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362 (2000). Under the “unreasonable  
 14 application” clause, a federal habeas court may grant the writ only if the state court identifies the  
 15 correct governing legal principle from the Supreme Court’s decisions, but unreasonably applies  
 16 that principle to the facts of the prisoner’s case. *Id.* The Supreme Court has made clear that a  
 17 state court’s decision may be overturned only if the application is “objectively unreasonable.”  
 18 *Lockyer v. Andrade*, 538 U.S. 63, 69 (2003).

19 Ineffective Assistance of Counsel

20 Petitioner asserts in his petition that he was denied the effective assistance of counsel when  
 21 his trial counsel, John Crowley, failed to (1) interview and call witness Warren Hagler; (2) to  
 22 present the Applebee’s Restaurant receipt as evidence at trial; and (3) to object to the prosecutor’s

01 closing argument. Petitioner also asserts that the ineffective assistance alleged in his first three  
02 grounds for relief cumulatively caused a prejudicial effect.

03 The Sixth Amendment guarantees a criminal defendant the right to effective assistance of  
04 counsel. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984). Claims of ineffective assistance  
05 of counsel are evaluated under the two-prong test set forth in *Strickland*. Under *Strickland*, a  
06 defendant must prove (1) that counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of  
07 reasonableness and, (2) that a reasonable probability exists that, but for counsel's error, the result  
08 of the proceedings would have been different. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 688, 691-92.

09 When considering the first prong of the *Strickland* test, judicial scrutiny must be highly  
10 deferential. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 689. There is a strong presumption that counsel's  
11 performance fell within the wide range of reasonably effective assistance. *Id*. The Ninth Circuit  
12 has made clear that “[a] fair assessment of attorney performance requires that every effort be made  
13 to eliminate the distorting effects of hindsight, to reconstruct the circumstances of counsel's  
14 challenged conduct, and to evaluate the conduct from counsel's perspective at the time.”  
15 *Campbell v. Wood*, 18 F.3d 662 (9th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 689).

16 The second prong of the *Strickland* test requires a showing of actual prejudice related to  
17 counsel's performance. The petitioner must demonstrate that it is reasonably probable that, but  
18 for counsel's errors, the result of the proceedings would have been different. The reviewing Court  
19 need not address both components of the inquiry if an insufficient showing is made on one  
20 component. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 697. Furthermore, if both components are to be considered,  
21 there is no prescribed order in which to address them. *Id*.

22

01        **1.        *Failure to Interview and Call Witness Warren Hagler***

02        Petitioner asserts in his first ground for relief that his trial counsel's failure to interview  
 03 Warren Hagler and to present him as a defense witness at trial constituted ineffective assistance  
 04 of counsel. The state courts rejected this claim in petitioner's personal restraint proceedings.

05        The Court of Appeals explained its conclusion as follows:

06        Warren Hagler. Harris has provided a sworn declaration by Warren Hagler,  
 07 who has known Harris since the two were incarcerated together in a juvenile facility.  
 08 In the summer of 2002, while looking for prostitutes to work for him in another state,  
 09 Hagler met a young woman named Brandy. Brandy said she would not leave the state  
 10 because she had to testify. She said a man had assaulted her, but police were  
 11 threatening her to make her testify to more than just an assault so he would get a  
 12 longer sentence. Only when Brandy said the man's name was Mzee Harris, did  
 13 Hagler realize she was talking about his friend. Later that summer, Hagler happened  
 14 to meet a girl named Malika. When he told Malika about Brandy, he learned for the  
 15 first time that Malika was Harris's sister. From Hagler's description, Malika knew  
 16 Hagler had met Bonin-Gamble. According to declarations by Malika Harris and  
 17 Harris's mother, they relayed Hagler's information to Crowley, but Crowley never  
 18 contacted him.

19        Harris argues there was no legitimate reason for failing to interview Hagler  
 20 and call him to testify. He contends he was prejudiced because there was a reasonable  
 21 chance the jury would have acquitted him of all charges had they heard Hagler's  
 22 testimony. We disagree with both contentions.

23        In evaluating counsel's actions, we must "reconstruct the circumstances of  
 24 counsel's challenged conduct, and . . . evaluate the conduct from counsel's  
 25 perspective at the time."<sup>2</sup> Contrary to Harris's contention, defense counsel's duty to  
 26 investigate "does not necessarily require that every conceivable witness be  
 27 interviewed."<sup>3</sup> Rather, the duty is either to make a reasonable investigation or to

28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 8010  
 8011  
 8012  
 8013  
 8014  
 8015  
 8016  
 8017  
 8018  
 8019  
 8020  
 8021  
 8022  
 8023  
 8024  
 8025  
 8026  
 8027  
 8028  
 8029  
 8030  
 8031  
 8032  
 8033  
 8034  
 8035  
 8036  
 8037  
 8038  
 8039  
 8040  
 8041  
 8042  
 8043  
 8044  
 8045  
 8046  
 8047  
 8048  
 8049  
 8050  
 8051  
 8052  
 8053  
 8054  
 8055  
 8056  
 8057  
 8058  
 8059  
 8060  
 8061  
 8062  
 8063  
 8064  
 8065  
 8066  
 8067  
 8068  
 8069  
 8070  
 8071  
 8072  
 8073  
 8074  
 8075  
 8076  
 8077  
 8078  
 8079  
 8080  
 8081  
 8082  
 8083  
 8084  
 8085  
 8086  
 8087  
 8088  
 8089  
 8090  
 8091  
 8092  
 8093  
 8094  
 8095  
 8096  
 8097  
 8098  
 8099  
 80100  
 80101  
 80102  
 80103  
 80104  
 80105  
 80106  
 80107  
 80108  
 80109  
 80110  
 80111  
 80112  
 80113  
 80114  
 80115  
 80116  
 80117  
 80118  
 80119  
 80120  
 80121  
 80122  
 80123  
 80124  
 80125  
 80126  
 80127  
 80128  
 80129  
 80130  
 80131  
 80132  
 80133  
 80134  
 80135  
 80136  
 80137  
 80138  
 80139  
 80140  
 80141  
 80142  
 80143  
 80144  
 80145  
 80146  
 80147  
 80148  
 80149  
 80150  
 80151  
 80152  
 80153  
 80154  
 80155  
 80156  
 80157  
 80158  
 80159  
 80160  
 80161  
 80162  
 80163  
 80164  
 80165  
 80166  
 80167  
 80168  
 80169  
 80170  
 80171  
 80172  
 80173  
 80174  
 80175  
 80176  
 80177  
 80178  
 80179  
 80180  
 80181  
 80182  
 80183  
 80184  
 80185  
 80186  
 80187  
 80188  
 80189  
 80190  
 80191  
 80192  
 80193  
 80194  
 80195  
 80196  
 80197  
 80198  
 80199  
 80200  
 80201  
 80202  
 80203  
 80204  
 80205  
 80206  
 80207  
 80208  
 80209  
 80210  
 80211  
 80212  
 80213  
 80214  
 80215  
 80216  
 80217  
 80218  
 80219  
 80220  
 80221  
 80222  
 80223  
 80224  
 80225  
 80226  
 80227  
 80228  
 80229  
 80230  
 80231  
 80232  
 80233  
 80234  
 80235  
 80236  
 80237  
 80238  
 80239  
 80240  
 80241  
 80242  
 80243  
 80244  
 80245  
 80246  
 80247  
 80248  
 80249  
 80250  
 80251  
 80252  
 80253  
 80254  
 80255  
 80256  
 80257  
 80258  
 80259  
 80260  
 80261  
 80262  
 80263  
 80264  
 80265  
 80266  
 80267  
 80268  
 80269  
 80270  
 80271  
 80272  
 80273  
 80274  
 80275  
 80276  
 80277  
 80278  
 80279  
 80280  
 80281  
 80282  
 80283  
 80284  
 80285  
 80286  
 80287  
 80288  
 80289  
 80290  
 80291  
 80292  
 80293  
 80294  
 80295  
 80296  
 80297  
 80298  
 80299  
 80300  
 80301  
 80302  
 80303  
 80304  
 80305  
 80306  
 80307  
 80308  
 80309  
 80310  
 80311  
 80312  
 80313  
 80314  
 80315  
 80316  
 80317  
 80318  
 80319  
 80320  
 80321  
 80322  
 80323  
 80324  
 80325  
 80326  
 80327  
 80328  
 80329  
 80330  
 80331  
 80332  
 80333  
 80334  
 80335  
 80336  
 80337  
 80338  
 80339  
 80340  
 80341  
 80342  
 80343  
 80344  
 80345  
 80346  
 80347  
 80348  
 80349  
 80350  
 80351  
 80352  
 80353  
 80354  
 80355  
 80356  
 80357  
 80358  
 80359  
 80360  
 80361  
 80362  
 80363  
 80364  
 80365  
 80366  
 80367  
 80368  
 80369  
 80370  
 80371  
 80372  
 80373  
 80374  
 80375  
 80376  
 80377  
 80378  
 80379  
 80380  
 80381  
 80382  
 80383  
 80384  
 80385  
 80386  
 80387  
 80388  
 80389  
 80390  
 80391  
 80392  
 80393  
 80394  
 80395  
 80396  
 80397  
 80398  
 80399  
 80400  
 80401  
 80402  
 80403  
 80404  
 80405  
 80406  
 80407  
 80408  
 80409  
 80410  
 80411  
 80412  
 80413  
 80414  
 80415  
 80416  
 80417  
 80418  
 80419  
 80420  
 80421  
 80422  
 80423  
 80424  
 80425  
 80426  
 80427  
 80428  
 80429  
 80430  
 80431  
 80432  
 80433  
 80434  
 80435  
 80436  
 80437  
 80438  
 80439  
 80440  
 80441  
 80442  
 80443  
 80444  
 80445  
 80446  
 80447  
 80448  
 80449  
 80450  
 80451  
 80452  
 80453  
 80454  
 80455  
 80456  
 80457  
 80458  
 80459  
 80460  
 80461  
 80462  
 80463  
 80464  
 80465  
 80466  
 80467  
 80468  
 80469  
 80470  
 80471  
 80472  
 80473  
 80474  
 80475  
 80476  
 80477  
 80478  
 80479  
 80480  
 80481  
 80482  
 80483  
 80484  
 80485  
 80486  
 80487  
 80488  
 80489  
 80490  
 80491  
 80492  
 80493  
 80494  
 80495  
 80496  
 80497  
 80498  
 80499  
 80500  
 80501  
 80502  
 80503  
 80504  
 80505  
 80506  
 80507  
 80508  
 80509  
 80510  
 80511  
 80512  
 80513  
 80514  
 80515  
 80516  
 80517  
 80518  
 80519  
 80520  
 80521  
 80522  
 80523  
 80524  
 80525  
 80526  
 80527  
 80528  
 80529  
 80530  
 80531  
 80532  
 80533  
 80534  
 80535  
 80536  
 80537  
 80538  
 80539  
 80540  
 80541  
 80542  
 80543  
 80544  
 80545  
 80546  
 80547  
 80548  
 80549  
 80550  
 80551  
 80552  
 80553  
 80554  
 80555  
 80556  
 80557  
 80558  
 80559  
 80560  
 80561  
 80562  
 80563  
 80564  
 80565  
 80566  
 80567  
 80568  
 80569  
 80570  
 80571  
 80572  
 80573  
 80574  
 80575  
 80576  
 80577  
 80578  
 80579  
 80580  
 80581  
 80582  
 80583  
 80584  
 80585<br

01 make a reasonable decision that makes particular investigations unnecessary.<sup>4</sup>

02 Crowley could reasonably have viewed Hagler's potential testimony as  
 03 problematic. First, it diverged from the defense theory of the case that "Rodney" had  
 04 assaulted Bonin-Gamble and Harris had only tried to help her. Evidence that Bonin-  
 05 Gamble had been consistent in saying that Harris had assaulted her could be seen as  
 06 inconsistent with Harris's claim of complete innocence. Second, a major defense  
 07 theme was that Harris was a well-intentioned young man from a stable middle class  
 08 family into which the drug-involved Bonin-Gamble was trying to insinuate herself.  
 09 Calling Hagler could have required disclosing his connection to Harris, the  
 10 circumstances of Hagler's meeting with Bonin-Gamble, and at least the portion of  
 11 Hagler's criminal history. Were the jury to learn he had committed crimes of  
 12 dishonesty, not to mention his history of promoting prostitution, the disclosures  
 13 would have severely detracted from that theme. Finally, Hagler's proposed testimony  
 14 describes a sequence of coincidences that might reasonably be considered highly  
 15 unlikely.

16 Given this, Crowley could justifiably view Hagler as a witness who would  
 17 cause more harm than good. This case is unlike State v. Byrd,<sup>5</sup> which Harris cites.  
 18 In Byrd, the issue was consent, not identity, and counsel failed to investigate an  
 19 eyewitness to the victim's demeanor at a time she said she was being forced to  
 20 accompany defendants against her will.<sup>6</sup>

21 Harris has also failed to show prejudice. While Bonin-Gamble's credibility  
 22 was in issue, the split verdict shows the corroboration provided by the medical and  
 23 forensic evidence and the young men from the next room is what led the jury to  
 24 convict on most counts. Harris has not shown Hagler's proposed testimony would  
 25 likely have affected the jury's view of this crucial evidence.

26 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 2 at 5-7.)

27 The Court of Appeals' conclusion that counsel's failure to interview Hagler and call him  
 28 as a witness did not constitute deficient performance is somewhat problematic. The Court of  
 29

---

30 <sup>4</sup> [Court of Appeals' Footnote 9] Sanders v. Ratelle, 21 F.3d 1446, 1456 (9th Cir. 1994).

31 <sup>5</sup> [Court of Appeals' Footnote 10] 30 Wn.App. 794, 638 P.2d 601 (1981).

32 <sup>6</sup> [Court of Appeals' Footnote 11] Byrd, 30 Wn. App. at 799.

01 Appeals, in ruling on this issue, had the benefit of Warren Hagler's declaration. In that  
02 declaration, Hagler provided details about his interaction with Brandy Bonin-Gamble. The Court  
03 of Appeals apparently relied on many of those details to reach its conclusion that counsel's failure  
04 to interview Hagler, and to call him as a witness, did not constitute deficient performance.

05 However, the Court of Appeals' analysis of why counsel might have viewed Hagler's  
06 potential testimony as problematic makes sense only if counsel had sufficient information to make  
07 that assessment. It is not clear from the record that he did. The declaration of Billie Harris, which  
08 was also provided to the state courts in conjunction with petitioner's personal restraint petition,  
09 suggests that the only facts which were passed along to counsel were that Hagler had a  
10 conversation with Brandy Bonin-Gamble during the summer of 2002, and that during that  
11 conversation Bonin-Gamble told Hagler she was going to testify against petitioner and she was  
12 going to say whatever the police wanted her to say because otherwise they would put her in jail.  
13 (See Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 6 at 33.) It seems unlikely that this limited amount of information would  
14 have allowed counsel to draw the conclusions suggested by the Court of Appeals.

15 Nonetheless, the record amply supports the Court of Appeals' conclusion that petitioner  
16 was not prejudiced by counsel's alleged deficient performance because nothing in the record  
17 suggests that Hagler's testimony would have altered the outcome of the trial. It appears that  
18 Hagler's testimony would have been inconsistent with the defense theory of the case and with  
19 much of the medical and forensic evidence presented by the prosecution. Moreover, the record  
20 suggests that Hagler might not have been a particularly credible witness and it is conceivable that  
21 he might have undermined petitioner's credibility.

22 Despite the apparent deficiencies in the analysis by the Court of Appeals, the Court of

01 Appeals' conclusion that petitioner was not prejudiced by counsel's alleged deficient performance  
02 with respect to Hagler was reasonable. Petitioner makes no showing to the contrary.  
03 Accordingly, petitioner's federal habeas petition should be denied with respect to his first ground  
04 for relief.

05 **2. *Applebee's Receipt***

06 Petitioner asserts in his second ground for relief that counsel's failure to introduce at trial  
07 an Applebee's Restaurant receipt constituted deficient performance. Petitioner provides no facts  
08 in his habeas petition to explain the significance of the Applebee's receipt or counsel's failure to  
09 introduce it. A review of petitioner's personal restraint petition offers some insight into these  
10 issues. The personal restraint petition indicates that the receipt in question, which was obtained  
11 from a friend of petitioner's, would have shown that food was purchased from Applebee's  
12 Restaurant on March 2, 2002. (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 6 at 30.) Petitioner's position appears to be that  
13 the receipt would have corroborated the testimony of petitioner and his friends that they went to  
14 Applebee's on that date to pick up an order of food and left the victim alone in the hotel room.  
15 (*Id.*, Ex. 6 at 45.) This was significant because it would have established that the victim had an  
16 opportunity to escape from petitioner but did not do so. (*Id.*) Petitioner's counsel referred to the  
17 receipt in his closing argument to support the proposition that the victim had an opportunity to  
18 escape, but he never introduced the receipt into evidence during the trial. (*Id.*, Ex. 6 at 45-46.)

19 The state courts rejected this claim in petitioner's personal restraint proceedings. The  
20 Court of Appeals explained its conclusion as follows:

21 The Applebee's receipt. During closing argument, Crowley contended the  
22 State had no answer for Harris's friends' testimony that Bonin-Gamble was left alone  
in the motel room while the three men got food from the restaurant:

01 So they can't explain that away, there's too many witnesses for them  
02 to explain away, ladies and gentlemen, they can't explain it away.

03 They get food, there is a receipt, it happened, Brandy was able to  
04 leave on her own accord, she didn't because she didn't want to.

05 The prosecutor responded that the only receipt in evidence was from  
06 McDonalds:

07 Mr. Crowley mentioned a receipt. There was no receipt from  
08 Applebee's. There is no receipt from Applebee's. The only receipt is  
09 from a McDonald's. And you will notice when you look at that  
10 receipt, that two meals were not purchased, just one. Just one meal.  
11 There's two people, but only one meal was purchased. And I would  
12 suggest to you that that meal was for Mr. Harris, not for Brandy.

13 Harris provides a declaration from Crowley's investigator, who says she  
14 obtained an Applebee's receipt from a defense witness, provided it to Crowley and  
15 speculates that he lost it. But even if Crowley's performance was deficient, Harris  
16 fails to show prejudice. Counsels' references to the receipt were isolated, minimal in  
17 proportion to their overall arguments, and as the State points out, immaterial given  
18 the undisputed evidence of other times that Harris left Bonin-Gamble alone. And  
19 because the receipt was for takeout food, it would not have established all three men  
20 in the room left Bonin-Gamble alone in any event.

21 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 2 at 8.)

22 Counsel's reliance on the receipt during closing arguments suggests that his failure to  
23 introduce the receipt into evidence was careless and not strategic. Nonetheless, the Court of  
24 Appeals' conclusion that petitioner was not prejudiced by counsel's failure to introduce the receipt  
25 was reasonable. While the receipt would have established that food was purchased on the date  
26 in question, it would not have established that the victim was necessarily left alone. Moreover,  
27 the record makes clear that there were other times during the course of the victim's ordeal when  
28 she was left alone which would appear to minimize the significance of her being left alone on this  
29 particular occasion. Petitioner offers nothing in these proceedings to demonstrate that the decision

01 of the state courts with respect to this claim was contrary to, or constituted an unreasonable  
 02 application of, federal law. Accordingly, petitioner's federal habeas petition should be denied with  
 03 respect to his second ground for relief.

04 **3. *Closing Argument***

05 Petitioner asserts in his third ground for relief that his counsel's failure to object to the  
 06 prosecutor's misconduct during closing argument constituted ineffective assistance of counsel.  
 07 The claim, as presented in the petition, is not a model of clarity. However, at issue appears to be  
 08 the prosecutor's reference, during his rebuttal closing argument, to a McDonald's receipt which  
 09 the prosecutor indicated showed only one meal while petitioner claims that the receipt actually  
 10 listed two meals.

11 The state courts rejected this claim in petitioner's personal restraint proceedings. The  
 12 Court of Appeals explained its decision as follows:

13 Failure to object to closing argument. Harris also claims Crowley should have  
 14 objected to the rebuttal argument quoted above because the McDonald's receipt  
 15 actually listed two meals.<sup>7</sup> He contends the argument unfairly implied he "was a  
 16 mean, sadistic, sexist person" because he shared no food with the hungry, injured  
 17 Bonin-Gamble. But Harris does not provide the receipt. And, as he acknowledges,  
 18 the prosecutor's characterization was understandable given a police officer's  
 19 description of the receipt.<sup>8</sup> Harris has not shown the argument exceeded counsel's

---

17  
 18 <sup>7</sup> The specific argument at issue was:

19 Mr. Crowley mentioned a receipt. There was no receipt from Applebee's. There is no  
 20 receipt from Applebee's. The only receipt is from a McDonald's. And you will notice when  
 21 you look at that receipt, that two meals were not purchased, just one. Just one meal.  
 22 There's two people, but only one meal was purchased. And I would suggest to you that  
 23 that meal was for Mr. Harris, not for Brandy.

24  
 25 <sup>8</sup> [Court of Appeals' Footnote 12] The officer testified the receipt showed: "One – two  
 26 cheese burger meals, one – two apple pies, one 16-ounce vanilla shake."

01 wide latitude to draw inferences from the evidence.<sup>9</sup>

02 Nor has Harris shown prejudice. Any problem Harris had with the jury's  
 03 perception of his attitude toward women was much more clearly presented by his own  
 04 testimony on cross-examination discussing Bonin-Gamble's alleged attack on him:  
 05 "A woman needs to stay in a woman's place. When a woman comes out of their  
 place, whatever happens after that happens, you know."

06 (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 2 at 9.)

07 Petitioner makes no showing that this decision was unreasonable or inconsistent with  
 08 firmly established federal law. A prosecutor has wide latitude during closing argument to make  
 09 reasonable inferences based on the evidence. *United States v. Molina*, 934 F.2d 1440, 1445 (9th  
 10 Cir. 1991). The prosecutor's argument with respect to the McDonald's receipt can be reasonably  
 11 construed as such an argument. It thus appears that there was no basis for petitioner's counsel  
 to object to this portion of the prosecutor's closing argument.

12 In addition, this Court must concur with the conclusion of the Court of Appeals with  
 13 respect to the prejudice issue. Petitioner's own testimony on cross-examination no doubt affected  
 14 the jury's perception of his attitude towards women more than the prosecutor's brief reference to  
 15 the implications to be drawn from a McDonald's receipt. As petitioner makes no showing that the  
 16 state courts' decision with respect to this claim was contrary to, or constituted an unreasonable  
 17 application of, federal law, petitioner's federal habeas petition should be denied with respect to  
 18 his third ground for relief.

19 / / /

---

20  
 21 <sup>9</sup> [Court of Appeals' Footnote 13] State v. Stenson, 132 Wn.2d 668, 727, 940 P.2d 1239  
 22 (1997). Harris adds a claim in passing that the prosecutor's arguments were reversible misconduct  
 regardless of counsel's failure to object. Because the argument was not improper, this claim also  
 fails.

01        **4.        *Cumulative Prejudice***

02        Petitioner asserts in his fourth ground for relief that the three claimed instances of  
 03 ineffective assistance accumulated to cause prejudice. Although no single error may warrant  
 04 habeas relief, “the cumulative effect of multiple errors may still prejudice a defendant.”    *See*  
 05 *Mancuso v. Olivarez*, 292 F.3d 939, 957 (9th Cir. 2002) (*citing United States v. Frederick*, 78  
 06 F.3d 1370, 1381 (9th Cir. 1996)). In this case, petitioner has established no constitutional error  
 07 arising out of his claims. Accordingly, there is nothing to accumulate to the level of a  
 08 constitutional violation. *See Mancuso* 292 F.3d at 957 (*citing Fuller v. Roe*, 182 F.3d 699, 704  
 09 (9th Cir. 1999), overruled on other grounds, *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 US 473 (2000)). Thus,  
 10 petitioner’s claim of cumulative error is without merit and his federal habeas petition should  
 11 therefore be denied with respect to his fourth ground for relief.

12                    Blakely Claim

13        Petitioner asserts in his fifth ground for federal habeas relief that his exceptional sentence  
 14 violates the rule announced in *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296 (2004). The Washington  
 15 Court of Appeals rejected this claim “because Blakely is not given retroactive effect and Harris’s  
 16 conviction was final before Blakely was issued.” (Dkt. No. 18, Ex. 2 at 10 (footnote omitted).)

17        Though the United States Supreme Court recently granted certiorari in *Burton v.*  
 18 *Waddington*, No. 03-35095, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 15497 (9th Cir. July 28, 2005), *cert. granted*,  
 19 126 S. Ct. 2352 (2006), and will address the issue of *Blakely* retroactivity, there is no current  
 20 United States Supreme Court precedent holding that *Blakely* may be applied retroactively to cases  
 21 such as petitioner’s which became final before *Blakely* was decided. Accordingly, petitioner’s  
 22 federal habeas petition should be denied with respect to his fifth ground for relief as well.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, this Court recommends that petitioner's federal habeas petition be denied and that this action be dismissed with prejudice. A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 18th day of January, 2007.

Mary Alice Theiler  
Mary Alice Theiler  
United States Magistrate Judge